



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,707	07/20/2000	David Greenblatt	194701US30	5304

22850 7590 08/11/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHAW, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/575,707

Applicant(s)

GREENBLATT, DAVID

Examiner

Joseph D Shaw

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,8-10 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The use of the trademark Windows has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.
2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 4, 8-10, and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. As per claims 4, 8-10, and 12, the claims do not conform to the embodiment provided in the disclosure. As stated in paragraph 40 of the disclosure, an alternative embodiment allows for the user to initiate voice communications via a voice over IP (VoIP) connection, eliminating the need for the user to dial a telephone number. However, the subject claims involve establishing VoIP communications and are dependent on claims that involve

dialing a telephone number. Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (6,104,711) in view of Dean et al. (6,223,292).

b. As per claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, and 12, Voit teaches a name translation system containing a name server that receives a textual domain name (URL) from clients and translates it into a telephone number (Abstract; col. 4, lines 29-30). The telephone number is returned to the client so that the client can dial the number and establish voice communications (col. 13, lines 51-62). However, Voit does not explicitly teach obtaining an identifier that corresponds to the electronic information being displayed. Dean teaches a plug-in client that obtains the URL (identifier) of a web page (electronic information) whenever a client computer is browsing the Internet (col. 4, lines 26-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the plug-in used for obtaining a URL as taught by Dean in the

system of Voit because obtaining the URL would allow the client machine to send it to a server so that the server could perform tasks based on that URL as taught by Dean (col. 6, lines 8-17).

c. As per claims 3, 7, and 13, Voit discloses the claimed invention modified by Dean as described above. Furthermore, Voit teaches the client machine communicating with the public switched telephone network gateway and initiating a telephone call through the central office (telephone switch)(col. 14, lines 1-16).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

d. Barkan et al. (6,366,575) teaches a system for establishing a telephone call between an agent station and an outside phone associated with a computer, the computer used to request the call with the agent.

e. Bannister et al. (6,430,282) teaches originating voice calls from a data service node that controls a telecommunications switch that connects two voice terminals.

f. Dunn et al. (6,163,536) teaches concurrent voice/data communications.

g. Miloslavsky (6,130,933) teaches customer communications with an agent via web communications with either the customer or agent originating the call.

- h. Johnson, Jr. et al. (6,072,780) teaches a computer controlled telephone switch used to control participants in a telephone conference.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Shaw whose telephone number is 703-305-0094. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM, and on alternate Fridays.
8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3718 for regular communications and 703-305-3718 for After Final communications.
9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.



JDS
August 4, 2003



RUPAL DHARIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER